

Appl. No. 09/812,210
Amdt. Dated October 25, 2004
Reply to Office action of July 30, 2004
Attorney Docket No. P12560-US1
EUS/J/P/04-3258

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claim Amendments

The Applicant has amended claims 2, 3, 5-8, 11-12, 15-17, and 31; claims 1 and 22-30 have been canceled. Applicant respectfully submits no new matter has been added. Accordingly, claims 2-21 and 31-37 are pending in the application. Favorable reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

Examiner Objections – Specification

The specification was objected to because of several informalities. The Applicant thanks the Examiner for his careful review of the specification. In response, the Applicant has modified the specification as suggested by the Examiner. The Examiner's consideration of the amendments to the specification is respectfully requested.

Examiner Objections - Claims

Claim 17 was objected to because of informalities. The Applicant has amended the claim as suggested by the Examiner in order to correct the informalities.

Claim 11 was objected to as to being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but was indicated as being allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. The Applicant has amended claim 11, containing allowable subject matter to include the limitations of independent claim 1. The Examiner's consideration of the amended claims is respectfully requested.

Allowable Subject Matter

The Applicant gratefully acknowledges the allowance of claims 34-37.

The Applicant notes with appreciation the conditional allowance of claims 11 and 31-33. As the Examiner has suggested, the insufficient antecedent bases for the limitations in claim 31 have been corrected. No amendments have been made to narrow the scope of the pending claims or to create any sort of estoppel. The Applicant respectfully submits that claims 31-33 are now in condition for allowance.

Appl. No. 09/812,210
Amdt. Dated October 25, 2004
Reply to Office action of July 30, 2004
Attorney Docket No. P12560-US1
EUS/JIP/04-3258

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claims 31-33 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter as the invention. The Applicant has corrected the deficiencies in claims 31-33 and the Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of these claims be withdrawn.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 102(e)

Claims 1-6, 8, 9 and 22-30 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Gorman, et al. (US 6,711,417 hereinafter Gorman). Claims 1 and 22-30 have been canceled. The Applicant has amended claim 11 as suggested by the Examiner in paragraph 10 of the Detailed Action. The limitations of claim 1 have been incorporated with the allowable subject matter of claim 11. Claims 2-10 now depend directly or indirectly from claim 11 and recite further limitations in combination with the novel elements of claim 11. The Examiner's consideration of the amended claims is respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a)

Claims 12-17, 19 and 21 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gorman in view of Kil (US 2001/0046859 A1, hereinafter Kil). The Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection of these claims.

The Gorman reference appears to disclose an interface between an integrated services hub and a wireless device. The hub receives RF communications from the wireless device and converts the communications into control and data signals on a broadband network.

Gorman is cited for teaching a local site communication system comprising a broadband connection, a wireless local site network and a cyber base station. However, amended claim 12 now includes the limitation deemed allowable in the Detailed Action. As such, claim 12 contains limitations that are analogous to the limitations in allowable claim 11:

Appl. No. 09/812,210
Amdt. Dated October 25, 2004
Reply to Office action of July 30, 2004
Attorney Docket No. P12560-US1
EUS/JJP/04-3258

The Kil reference appears to disclose a method for providing access to public and private mobile communication services. Kil accomplishes this method by providing a public and private communication service unit that optionally provides public and private communications to a connected mobile station. Kil is cited for teaching a radio base station serving a plurality of cells. Applicant's amended claim 12 recites, among other features, the switching of mobile terminal communication links with the public communication system being controlled by the MSC controlling switching of the mobile terminal communication links with the public communication system. As noted above, this step is allowable subject matter and is not taught or suggested by Gorman.

It is respectfully submitted that Kil does not address the above-identified deficiencies of Gorman with respect to Applicant's invention. The combination of the Gorman and Kil references fails to teach the MSC controlling switching of the mobile terminal communication links with the public communication system. Also, since claims 13-17, 19 and 21 depend directly or indirectly from claim 12, these claims also contain the allowable subject matter. The Applicant respectfully requests the withdrawal of the rejection of amended claim 12 and the dependent claims 13-17, 19 and 21.

Claims 7, 10, 18 and 20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gorman in view of Chen et al. (US 2001/0030950 A1 hereinafter Chen). Claims 7 and 10 depend from amended claim 11, which contains allowable subject matter. The Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection of these claims.

With regard to claim 18, the Chen reference is cited for disclosing a Bluetooth wireless local site network. With regard to claim 20 Chen is cited for disclosing broadband cables. However, Chen does not supply the missing limitation claimed in the Applicant's claim 12 from which both 18 and 20 depend; that of the MSC controlling switching of the mobile terminal communication links with the public communication system. This being the case, the Applicant respectfully submits that neither Gorman nor Chen individually or in combination teach the aforementioned limitation. The Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection of claims 18 and 20.


Appl. No. 09/812,210
Amdt. Dated October 25, 2004
Reply to Office action of July 30, 2004
Attorney Docket No. P12560-US1
EUS/J/P/04-3258

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing remarks, the Applicant believes all of the claims currently pending in the Application to be in a condition for allowance. The Applicant, therefore, respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw all rejections and issue a Notice of Allowance for all pending claims.

The Applicant requests a telephonic interview if the Examiner has any questions or requires any additional information that would further or expedite the prosecution of the Application.

Respectfully submitted,


By Sidney L. Weatherford
Registration No. 45,602

Date: October 25, 2004

Ericsson Inc.
6300 Legacy Drive, M/S EVR 1-C-11
Plano, Texas 75024

(972) 583-8656
sidney.weatherford@ericsson.com